Remarks

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding nonfinal Office Action mailed July 25, 2005. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kawakami.

With respect to the 102 rejection, the Examiner simply states: "Note lines 8-18 in column 8". Examiner Office Action, page 2.

Lines 8-18 in column 8 of Kawakami states as follows:

"*The CPU 10 reads an input tray code of each of the print job files from the RAM 15. The input tray code of each print job file indicates selected one of two or more input trays of the printer system relating to different paper sizes. It is necessary that the printer system is provided with those input trays. The CPU 10 reads a current input tray code of the printer system from the RAM 15. The current input tray code is already transmitted from the printer engine 2 to the RAM 15 via the engine I/F 16. A default value of the input tray code of the printer system is read from the NVRAM 13, and the CPU 10 checks that the read current input tray code is supported by the printer engine 2.*"

MPEP 2131 provides:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Appl. No. 10/033,148   -7-   Atty. Dkt. No. 10008248-1

102 rejection of Claim 1

Independent 1 states (emphasis added):

> A computer implemented method, comprising:
>
> (a)   transmitting a print job to a printer, the printer being responsive to the print job by converting the print job into printed media and discharging the printed media into an output tray; and
>
> (b)   **displaying an indicator that indicates the identity of the output tray.**

It is respectfully submitted that the 102 rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn for at least the reason that Kawakami does not disclose the element (i.e., element (b)) that is highlighted in claim 1 above.

More specifically, nowhere does Kawakami disclose **displaying** an indicator that indicates the identity of **a printer output tray**.

The Examiner appears to take the position that Kawakami at lines 8-18 in column 8 discloses element (b) of claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that this incorrect. This particular section cited by the Examiner discusses an **input tray** code that is apparently included in a print job file. Nothing that is disclosed in this cited section relates to **displaying** an indicator that identifies an **output tray**.   **It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that this cited section cannot disclose element (b) of claim 1 which is directed to displaying an indicator that indicates the identity of an output tray.**

Kawakami does disclose (in sections not cited by the Examiner) an "output tray code" that is included in a "print file".   Nowhere, however, does Kawakami disclose **displaying** an indicator that indicates the identity of a printer output tray.

Appl. No. 10/033,148   -8-   Atty. Dkt. No. 10008248-1

Thus, Kawakami does not anticipate claim 1, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

102 rejection of Claim 2

If independent claim 1 is not disclosed by Kawakami then its dependent claim 2 is also not disclosed because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 1. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Thus, Kawakami does not anticipate claim 2, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

102 rejection of Claim 3

If independent claim 1 is not disclosed by Kawakami then its dependent claim 3 is also not disclosed because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 1. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In addition, claim 3 recites: **wherein the indicator further indicates the present capacity of the output tray to receive additional media.**

It is respectfully submitted that the 102 rejection of claim 3 should be withdrawn for the additional reason that Kawakami does not disclose the wherein clause of claim 3 highlighted above.

As noted by the Examiner, Kawakami discloses an "input tray code" and (as Applicants note) Kawakami further discloses an "output tray code". There is no indication, however, that these two codes describe the present capacity of a printer output tray to receive additional media.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that nowhere does Kawakami disclose **displaying an indicator that both indicates the identity of an output tray and also the present capacity of the output tray to receive additional media.**

Appl. No. 10/033,148   -9-   Atty. Dkt. No. 10008248-1

Thus, for this additional reason, <u>Kawakami</u> does not anticipate claim 3, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

102 rejection of Claim 4

If claim 1 and claim 3 are not disclosed by <u>Kawakami</u> then dependent claim 4 is also not disclosed because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 1 and claim 3. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In addition, claim 4 further recites: **(c) periodically updating the indicator while the print job is being printed.**

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere does <u>Kawakami</u> disclose updating a displayed indicator **of any type** while a print job is being printed.

Thus <u>Kawakami</u> can not anticipate claim 4, and the rejection of claim 4 should be withdrawn.

102 rejection of Claim 5

If claim 1 and claim 3 are not disclosed by <u>Kawakami</u> then dependent claim 5 is also not disclosed because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 1 and claim 3. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In addition, claim 5 further recites: **wherein the indicator includes an image of the output tray with media contained therein.**

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere does <u>Kawakami</u> disclose an indicator that includes **an image of an output tray with media contained therein.** Thus <u>Kawakami</u> can not anticipate claim 5 for this additional reason, and the rejection of claim 5 should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/033,148   -10-   Atty. Dkt. No. 10008248-1

102 rejection of Claim 6

If claim 1 and claim 3 are not disclosed by Kawakami then dependent claim 6 is also not disclosed because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 1 and claim 3. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In addition, claim 6 further recites:

6. The method of claim 3, wherein the **Indicator includes an image of the output tray with a stack of media contained therein** and the method further comprising:
(c) **while media is being discharged into the output tray, periodically updating the image so as to increase the thickness of the stack.**

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere does Kawakami disclose an indicator that includes an image of a printer output tray with a stack of media contained therein. It is further respectfully submitted that nowhere does Kawakami disclose the step **of while media is being discharged into the output tray, periodically updating the image so as to increase the thickness of the stack.**

Thus Kawakami can not anticipate claim 6 for the additional reason that Kawakami does not disclose the elements of claim 6 highlighted above. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 6 should be withdrawn.

102 rejection of Claim 7

If claim 1 and claim 3 are not disclosed by Kawakami then dependent claim 7 is also not disclosed because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 1 and claim 3. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In addition, claim 7 further recites:

Appl. No. 10/033,148 -11- Atty. Dkt. No. 10008248-1

7.   The method of claim 3, wherein the indicator Includes an animated image of the printer.

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere does <u>Kawakami</u> disclose an animated image of a printer. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the 102 rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn for the additional reason that <u>Kawakami</u> does not disclose the wherein clause of claim 7 highlighted above.

Thus, for this additional reason, <u>Kawakami</u> does not anticipate claim 7, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

102 rejection of Claim 8

If claim 1 and claim 3 are not disclosed by <u>Kawakami</u> then dependent claim 8 is also not disclosed because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 1 and claim 3. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In addition, claim 8 further recites:

8.   The method of claim 3, wherein step (b) includes the following substeps:
        (b.1) **displaying an image of the output tray; and**
        (b.2) **while the printed media Is being discharged In the output tray,**
displaying an image of media moving into the output tray.

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere does <u>Kawakami</u> disclose displaying an image of an output tray. It is further submitted that nowhere does <u>Kawakami</u> disclose the step of displaying an image of media moving into an output tray while printed media is being discharged into the output tray of the printer.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the <u>Kawakami</u> does not disclose the elements of claim 8 highlighted above. Thus, for this additional reason, <u>Kawakami</u> does not anticipate claim 8, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/033,148   -12-   Atty. Dkt. No. 10008248-1

102 rejection of Claim 9

If claim 1 and claim 3 are not disclosed by <u>Kawakami</u> then dependent claim 9 is also not disclosed because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 1 and claim 3. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In addition, claim 9 further recites:

9.   The method of claim 3, wherein the indicator includes an image and the method further comprising:

(c)   **periodically determining the present number of media in the output tray; and**

(d)   **when the present number is within a first pre-determined range, causing the image to be displayed in a first configuration; and**

e)   **when the present number is within a second pre-determined range, causing the image to be displayed in a second configuration.**

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere does <u>Kawakami</u> disclose <u>any</u> of the claim 9 elements highlighted above. Thus, for this additional reason, <u>Kawakami</u> does not anticipate claim 9, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

102 rejection of Claim 10

If claim 1 and claim 3 are not disclosed by <u>Kawakami</u> then dependent claim 10 is also not disclosed because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 1 and claim 3. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In addition, claim 10 further recites:

> 10.   The method of claim 3, wherein the indicator includes an image and the method further comprising:
>
> (c)   periodically determining the present number of media in the output tray; and
>
> (d)   when the present number is within a first pre-determined range, causing the image to be displayed in a first color; and
>
> (e)   when the present number is within a second pre-determined range, causing the image to be displayed in a second color.

Nowhere does Kawakami disclose periodically determining the present number of media in an output tray. Further, nowhere does Kawakami disclose selectively displaying any type of image in one of two different colors.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that Kawakami cannot disclose any of the claim 10 elements highlighted above. Thus, for this additional reason, Kawakami does not anticipate claim 10, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

102 rejection of Claim 11

Independent claim 11 states:

> 11.   A server, comprising:
>
> (a)   means for receiving a request from a client;
>
> (b)   means for responding to the request by transmitting a program of computer readable instructions to the client, the program for enabling the client to:
>
> i)   use a specific printer having a plurality of output trays to print a document; and
>
> ii)   display an indicator that indicates the identity of an output tray from the plurality of output trays that receives the document.

Appl. No. 10/033,148   -14-   Atty. Dkt. No. 10008248-1

It is respectfully submitted that the 102 rejection of claim 11 should be withdrawn for at least the reason that Kawakami does not disclose the features that are highlighted in claim 11 above.

Kawakami discloses a "file server". Nowhere, however does Kawakami disclose a server that can serve a program for enabling a client **to use a specific printer having a plurality of output trays to print a document.** Thus, Kawakami does not anticipate claim 1, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

In addition, nowhere does Kawakami disclose a server that can serve a program for enabling a client **to use a specific printer having a plurality of output trays to print a document AND to display an indicator that indicates the identity of an output tray from the plurality of output trays that receives the document.**

Thus, for this additional reason, Kawakami does not anticipate claim 11, and the rejection should be withdrawn

102 rejection of Claim 12

If claim 11 is not disclosed by Kawakami then dependent claim 12 is also not disclosed because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 11. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In addition, claim 12 further recites: **wherein the server is the printer.**

Nowhere does Kawakami disclose a printer that can serve a program to a client.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the 102 rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn for the additional reason that Kawakami does not disclose the claim 12 element highlighted above.

Appl. No. 10/033,148   -15-   Atty. Dkt. No. 10008248-1

Thus, for this additional reason, Kawakami does not anticipate claim 12, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

102 rejection of Claim 13

If claim 11 is not disclosed by Kawakami then dependent claim 13 is also not disclosed because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 11. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In addition, claim 13 further recites: **wherein the indicator includes an image of the printer.**

Nowhere does Kawakami mentions displaying an image of a particular printer.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the 102 rejection of claim 13 should be withdrawn for the additional reason that Kawakami does not disclose the claim 13 element highlighted above.

Thus, for this additional reason, Kawakami does not anticipate claim 13, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

102 rejection of Claim 14

If claim 11 is not disclosed by Kawakami then dependent claim 14 is also not disclosed because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 11. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In addition, claim 14 further recites:

14. The server of claim 11, **wherein the indicator includes an image of the output tray that is receiving the document.**

Appl. No. 10/033,148 -16- Atty. Dkt. No. 10008248-1

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere does <u>Kawakami</u> mention displaying an image of an output tray that is receiving a document.

Accordingly, <u>Kawakami</u> does not disclose the claim 14 element highlighted above.

Thus, for this additional reason, Kawakami does not anticipate claim 13, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

102 rejection of Claim 15

If claim 11 is not disclosed by <u>Kawakami</u> then dependent claim 15 Is also not disclosed at least because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 11. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

102 rejection of Claim 16

If claim 11 is not disclosed by <u>Kawakami</u> then dependent claim 16 is also not disclosed at least because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 11. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In addition, claim 16 further recites: **wherein the indicator further Indicates the present capacity of the output tray that is receiving the document to accept additional media.**

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere does <u>Kawakami</u> disclose an indicator that indicates the **present capacity** of a printer output tray that is receiving a document.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that <u>Kawakami</u> does not disclose the claim 16 element highlighted above.

Thus, for this additional reason, <u>Kawakami</u> does not anticipate claim 16, and the rejection should be withdrawn

Appl. No. 10/033,148   -17-   Atty. Dkt. No. 10008248-1

102 rejection of Claim 17

If claim 11 is not disclosed by <u>Kawakami</u> then dependent claim 17 is also not disclosed at least because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 11. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In addition, claim 17 further recites: **wherein the indicator includes an animated image of the printer.**

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere does <u>Kawakami</u> disclose an indicator that **includes an animated image of a printer.**

Accordingly, <u>Kawakami</u> cannot disclose the claim 17 element highlighted above.

Thus, for this additional reason, <u>Kawakami</u> does not anticipate claim 17, and the rejection should be withdrawn

102 rejection of Claim 18

If claim 11 is not disclosed by <u>Kawakami</u> then dependent claim 18 is also not disclosed at least because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 11. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). ·

102 rejection of claim 19

Independent 19 states:

Appl. No. 10/033,148   -18-   Atty. Dkt. No. 10008248-1

19. A computer readable medium embodying a program of instructions for causing a computer to perform method steps, the method steps comprising:

displaying an indicator that identifies an output tray in a printer that is presently receiving a particular print job.

It is respectfully submitted that the 102 rejection of claim 19 should be withdrawn for at least the reason that Kawakami does not disclose the features that are highlighted in claim 19 above.

More specifically, nowhere does Kawakami disclose **displaying** an indicator that identifies an output tray in a printer **that is presently receiving a particular print job.**

Thus, Kawakami does not anticipate claim 19, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

102 rejection of claim 20

If claim 19 is not disclosed by Kawakami then dependent claim 20 is also not disclosed at least because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 19. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In addition, claim 20 recites: **wherein the indicator includes an image of the printer with media dynamically moving into the output tray.**

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere does Kawakami discloses an indicator that includes an image of a printer with media dynamically moving into the printer output tray.

Accordingly, Kawakami cannot disclose the claim 20 element highlighted above.

Thus, for this additional reason, Kawakami does not anticipate claim 20, and the rejection should be withdrawn

Appl. No. 10/033,148   -19-   Atty. Dkt. No. 10008248-1

102 rejection of claim 21

If claim 19 is not disclosed by <u>Kawakami</u> then dependent claim 21 is also not disclosed at least because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 19. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

102 rejection of claim 22

If claim 19 is not disclosed by <u>Kawakami</u> then dependent claim 21 is also not disclosed at least because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 19. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In addition, claim 22 recites: **displaying an indicator that indicates the present capacity of the output tray to receive additional media.**

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere does <u>Kawakami</u> discloses an indicator that indicates the present capacity of a printer output tray to receive additional media.

Accordingly, <u>Kawakami</u> cannot disclose the claim 22 element highlighted above.

Thus, for this additional reason, <u>Kawakami</u> does not anticipate claim 22, and the rejection should be withdrawn

102 rejection of claim 23

If claim 19 is not disclosed by <u>Kawakami</u> then dependent claim 23 is also not disclosed at least because this claim contains all features/elements/steps of independent claim 19. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).
In addition, claim 23 recites: **wherein the indicator includes an animated image of the printer.**

Appl. No. 10/033,148   -20-   Atty. Dkt. No. 10008248-1

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere does <u>Kawakami</u> discloses an indicator that includes an animated image of a printer.

Accordingly, <u>Kawakami</u> cannot disclose the claim 23 element highlighted above. ·

Thus, for this additional reason, <u>Kawakami</u> does not anticipate claim 23, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

102 rejection of claim 24

Independent 24 states:

24. A printer having a plurality of output trays, comprising:
apparatus for responding to a request received from a client by transmitting a **program of computer readable instructions to the client, the program for enabling the client to:**
i)   use the printer to print a document; and
ii) display an indicator that indicates an output tray from the plurality of output trays that receives the document.

It is respectfully submitted that the 102 rejection of claim 24 should be withdrawn for at least the reason that <u>Kawakami</u> does not disclose the features that are highlighted in claim 24 above.

Nowhere does <u>Kawakami</u> disclose a **printer** that can transmit, to a client, a program for enabling a client to **use the printer to print a document.** Accordingly, <u>Kawakami</u> cannot disclose the claim 24 element (i) highlighted above.

For this reason alone, <u>Kawakami</u> does not anticipate claim 24, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/033,148   -21-   Atty. Dkt. No. 10008248-1

Additionally, nowhere does Kawakami disclose a printer that can transmit, to a client, a program for enabling a client to **display an indicator that indicates an output tray from the plurality of output trays that receives the document.** Accordingly, Kawakami cannot disclose the claim 24 element (ii) highlighted above.

Thus, for this additional reason, Kawakami does not anticipate claim 24, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

102 rejection of claims 25-27

If claim 24 is not disclosed by Kawakami then dependent claims 25-27 are also not disclosed at least because these claims contain all features/elements/steps of independent claim 24. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In addition, claim 25 further recites, **wherein the indicator includes an image of the printer.**

As previously noted, nowhere does Kawakami disclose an indicator that includes an image of a printer. Accordingly, for this additional reason, Kawakami does not anticipate claim 25.

Claim 26 further recites: **wherein the program is further for enabling the client to inform a user the present capacity of the output tray receiving the document.**

Nowhere does Kawakami disclose a program that is served by a server to a client that enables the client to inform a user of the present capacity of an output tray receiving the document. Accordingly, for this additional reason, Kawakami does not anticipate claim 26.

Claim 27 further recites: The printer of claim 24, **wherein the indicator includes an animated image of the printer.** Nowhere does Kawakami disclose a program that is served by a server to a client that enables the client to display an indicator that includes an animated

Appl. No. 10/033,148   -22-   Atty. Dkt. No. 10008248-1

image of the printer that originally transmitted the program. Accordingly, for this additional reason, <u>Kawakami</u> does not anticipate claim 27.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance, in view of the above remarks. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowability covering the pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, or if a telephone interview would in any way advance prosecution of the application, please contact the undersigned attorney of record.

Respectfully submitted,
Shell S. Simpson et al.

Date ___11/23/05___

By _____
Matthew L. Wade
Registration No. 42,206
Telephone: 208 396 5263

Hewlett-Packard Company
P.O. Box 272400 M/S 35
Fort Collins CO 80527-2400

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria, VA, on ___11-23-2005___, to PTO fax no. (571) 273-8300.

Typed Name of Person Sending Facsimile: Chris Guthrie

Signature: ___Chris Guthrie___

Appl. No. 10/033,148   -23-   Atty. Dkt. No. 10008248-1